34298

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Margaret J. Brackstone

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* Teaching Teachers to Respond Effectively To Provocation in the Classroom

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M.Ed in Counselling Psychology

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1977

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. Peter Calder

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* Oct. 20/77 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Margaret J. Brackstone

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 16 Greystone Pl
St. Albert
Alberta T8N0Z7

NL-91 (3-74)

MARKS ON ORIGINAL

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (3/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

TEACHING TEACHERS TO RESPOND EFFECTIVELY TO PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

by

© Margaret J. Brackstone

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Teaching Teachers to Respond Effectively to Provocation in the Classroom" submitted by Margaret J. Brackstone in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Peter Calder
Supervisor

Susan Therrien

H. W. Zigli

Date June 30, 1977

ABSTRACT

The general purpose of this study was to develop, implement and evaluate a program designed to teach teachers to respond effectively to provocation in the classroom. More specifically, the intent was to develop a workshop which could be used as inservice training for experienced teachers, or as a learning module in undergraduate teacher education.

The workshop developed incorporates a theoretical presentation, modeling, and guided role playing. Evaluation involved subjective evaluation by participants, a short written test, and raters' comparisons of treatment versus control subjects' handling of videotaped role play confrontations with provoking student actors.

The results demonstrate the general effectiveness of the workshop in teaching the recommended method of intervention. Statistically significant differences were obtained on four out of the five components taught, and also on the raters' comparisons of the treatment versus control group total scores on the composite response taught.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Peter Calder, for his encouragement and guidance throughout this study. I would also like to thank Dr. Susan Therrien and Dr. Harvey Zingle for their kind assistance as committee members.

I am grateful to Ed. Franzoni, and to Mike Burrell, Jill Koziey, Dave Williams and Sheree Zingle for their earnest participation as actors in the modeling tape. I would also like to extend special thanks to Darlene Bayers for video-taping, and assisting with rating and proofreading. Margaret Jamieson's assistance with rating is also appreciated.

Finally, I would like to express warm appreciation to Sandi Wolfe for her continuous encouragement and frequent consultation which were vital during the writing of this thesis, and to my husband Paul for his constant support and his unique contribution to this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Nature of the Problem	1
	The Purpose of the Study	3
	Limitations	4
	Overview of the Study	5
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
	Typical Teacher Response to Provocation	6
	Authenticity in Teacher-Student Relationships	9
	Strategies for Teacher Management of Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom	12
	Definitions of Disruptive Behavior	13
	Behavior Therapy Approaches	16
	Adlerian Approach	19
	Ginott's Approach	21
	Application of Kounin's Research	23
	Gordon's Approach	25
	Program Development	28
	Objectives	28
	Modeling	29
	Role Playing	31
	Assertive Training	32
	Summary	34

CHAPTER PAGE

III. DEVELOPMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF TREATMENT PROGRAM 35

Development 35

General Objectives 35

Specific Objectives 35

Selection of Provoking Situations 36

Preparation of Modeling Tapes 38

Description 39

General Introduction and Objectives 39

Viewing Modeling Tapes and Discussion . . . 41

Essential Components of Teacher Response to Provocation 42

Examples of Provoking Behavior in the Classroom 43

Role Play Practice in Small Groups 43

Summary and Feedback 46

Written Evaluation of Workshop 46

Written Test 46

IV. IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF TREATMENT PROGRAM 49

Hypotheses 49

Sample 50

Research Design 52

Evaluation Methods 53

Written Test 53

Videotaped Role Play Confrontations With Provoking Students 53

CHAPTER PAGE

Rating of Videotaped Role Play Confrontations 56

Subjective Evaluation 58

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 59

Results 59

Results of Written Test 59

Videotaped Role Play Confrontations 61

Subjective Evaluations 61

Discussion 66

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 73

Summary 73

Conclusions 73

Recommendations 74

Program Improvements 74

Further Research 75

REFERENCES 77

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A 86

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Years of Teaching Experience . .	50
2.	Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Grade Level Taught	51
3.	Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Location of School	52
4.	Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Sex of Participants	52
5.	A Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on Individual Criteria	62
6.	A Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on Mean Total Scores	62
7.	Summary of Treatment Subjects' Reponses to Participant Evaluation	64

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Workshop Format.	37
2.	Examples of Provoking Behavior in the Classroom.	44
3.	Observer Guide for Role Play Situations	45
4.	Participant Evaluation	47
5.	Test	48
6.	Test With Suggested Answers and Scoring Criteria	54
7.	Rating Criteria	57

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Nature of the Problem

"Prominent among the array of psychosocial stressors are the day-to-day provocation experiences that incite the arousal of anger." (Novaco, 1975, p. xi).

Failure to cope effectively with provocation can be particularly unfortunate in one's work situation, especially in settings which demand interpersonal competence. One such setting is the school, where teachers are at times confronted with students whose behavior causes them to feel frustrated, irritated and angry.

Pupil disruptive behaviors, and related teacher interventions, remain a focus of concern for teachers and student teachers alike (Carnot, 1973; Chiu, 1975; Driscoll, 1971; Fink, 1973; Jones and Blankenship, 1972; Palardy and Mudrey, 1973; Purkey and Avila, 1971; Winston, 1976). In fact, Carnot (1973) states that the issue of classroom discipline causes teachers greater anguish and worry than any other aspect of the total school program. This was borne out recently in Lethbridge, Alberta when 300 out of 500 teachers in attendance at the District Teacher's Conference chose to register for a session on Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom when this was one alternative out of approximately fifteen (Zingle, 1977).

Gordon (1974) and others (Chamberlain and Weinberg, 1971; Kass and Drabman, 1970; Keith, Tornatzky and Pettigrew, 1974; McCarthy, 1975) maintain that teachers tend to handle such

confrontations ineffectively, relying on threats, insults, punishment and blaming, both overt and concealed. Such responses often lead to escalation of hostilities and deterioration of teacher-student relationships (Carnot, 1973; Kass and Drabman, 1970; McCarthy, 1975).

Considerable literature and research have been devoted to the problem of maintaining classroom discipline. For example, Gnagey (1975) recently summarized findings from 143 sources, in an attempt to present teachers with specific practical suggestions for effective classroom management. Many of the approaches recommended by Gnagey (1975) and others (Brown and Phelps, 1961; Chamberlin, 1971; Dunkin and Biddle, 1974; Francis, 1975; Karlin and Berger, 1972; Kounin, 1970; Maccoby, 1971), require that teachers re-examine their entire philosophy of education, and substantially modify instructional methodologies. While these are undoubtedly valuable and necessary processes for teachers to engage in, it is felt that teachers would benefit from a specific learning experience, focusing on a particular classroom event: developing more effective and humanistic coping strategies with students who provoke them. There are indications (Vander Kolk, 1975) that teachers are very receptive to programs geared toward improving the quality of teacher-student relationships, and that significant change in teacher performance can result from specific training in interpersonal skills (Carducci, 1976; Vander Kolk, 1975).

Gordon (1974) suggests the need for teachers to learn to confront provoking students in ways which have a low probability of damaging the student's self-esteem and, at the same time, a high probability of influencing them to modify their own behavior. Gordon recommends an honest expression of feeling from the teacher, letting the student know just how his behavior is interfering with the teacher's needs. Gordon's suggested methods of intervention constituted the primary focus of the workshop developed in conjunction with this study.

Purpose of the Study

The intent of this study was to develop, implement and evaluate a program designed to teach experienced teachers to respond effectively to provocation by students.

More specifically, the purpose of this study was to develop a workshop which could be used as inservice training with experienced teachers, or as a learning module in undergraduate teacher education. The workshop developed was based largely on the theory of Thomas Gordon, and incorporated modeling and guided role playing. For the purposes of the study, the workshop was conducted and evaluated with a group of experienced teachers who were registered in an Educational Psychology course, University of Alberta. Evaluation involved subjective evaluation by participants, a short written test and role play confrontation with provoking students.

Limitations

Considerable effort was directed toward making the modeling, role play and test situations as realistic and relevant as possible, in order to promote generalizability to real-life situations. However, it is recognized that there are serious limitations (Good, Biddle, and Brophy, 1975) in generalizing from laboratory to actual classroom settings.

It was not the intent in this study to demonstrate the relative effectiveness of components of the workshop, rather, to evaluate its effectiveness as a whole.

For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that Gordon's (1974) suggested method of intervening with provoking students, is an effective method. Although this assumption is acknowledged as a significant limitation (Good, Biddle and Brophy, 1975; McNeil and Popham, 1973; Peck and Tucker, 1973), no attempt was made here to demonstrate resulting improvement in student behavior. Also, there was no intention to endorse Gordon's approach as the best or only useful teacher response to provocation. Rather, it was intended to present this approach as a useful alternative, which teachers may wish to have in their response repertoire.

Limitations to the evaluative component of the study include the fact that the effects of the workshop leader characteristics remains unexamined. As well, it should be

pointed out that the subjects in this study were probably well motivated to learn the approach presented in the workshop, as they had enrolled in a course dealing with interpersonal relationships in the classroom. Other factors such as group interaction effects, timing, environmental comfort, etc. also undoubtedly influenced learning outcomes and limit generalizability.

Overview of the Study

Chapter I introduces the focus of this study, indicates its purpose, and identifies some limitations. Chapter II reviews relevant literature in the areas of typical teacher response to provocation, authenticity in teacher-student relationships, teacher strategies for management of disruptive behavior in the classroom and program development. Chapter III describes the development and gives a detailed description of the program. Chapter IV describes the implementation and evaluation of the program. Chapter V presents results and discussion. Chapter VI gives a summary and presents conclusions and recommendations related to the study and the conduction of future workshops using this model. Appendix A contains a teaching manual for the workshop.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A search of recent publications in the fields of education and psychology yielded concentrations of literature, relevant to this study, falling in the general areas of: typical teacher response to provocation; authenticity in teacher-student relationships; strategies for teacher management of disruptive behavior in the classroom; and program development. Reviews of literature in these four areas are presented herewith.

Typical Teacher Response to Provocation

Mention was made in Chapter I of the extent of teacher and student teacher concern regarding classroom control and discipline. Chiu (1975) reports further that when 3,000 prospective teachers were asked, "What gives you the greatest concern or worry as you plan for your first teaching position?" 80 percent answered: "Discipline." This being the case, one might expect that considerable attention has been paid to the study of this issue. Unfortunately, however, this assumption is not supported (Alschuler and Shea, 1974; Chiu, 1975) when one reviews the literature of empirical research in the area.

Considerable attention is, however, given to documenting the fact that teachers do experience difficulty in their responses to provocation, and in identifying typical teacher responses. For example, Chiu (1975) collected 'critical incidents' of discipline management from 85 senior student

teachers, following sixteen week practice teaching experiences, and found that they reported using threats, and punishment in 80 percent of provoking situations, although they frequently described these responses as ineffective.

John Shea, principal of a junior high school in Massachusetts, having identified discipline as the school's most important problem, collaborated in a two-year study with Alschuler and his colleagues of the University of Massachusetts, to investigate this problem (Alschuler and Shea, 1974). They found the following teacher behaviors to be the most common responses to provocation: body language (e.g. pointing, finger snapping, staring), ignoring, making loud noises (e.g. slamming door, slapping down ruler), ordering, invoking sarcasm, threatening and implementing threats, delivering mini-lectures, and making physical contact.

Thomas Gordon (1974) has found that teachers attending teacher effectiveness classes, when asked to respond to provoking student behavior, do so 90-95 percent of the time in ways which have a high probability of producing one of the following effects or outcomes: causing students to resist change, causing students to feel that the teacher thinks they're stupid or incapable, making students feel the teacher has little consideration for them as people, making students feel guilty, ashamed, or embarrassed, chipping away at students' self-esteem, provoking anger and revenge, and causing students to give up.

Haim Ginott (1972) has also identified what he sees as common, but destructive teacher responses to misbehavior. These include such things as cutting comments, getting laughs at a student's expense, name calling, sarcasm, verbal spankings, rudeness, preaching and dwelling on minor incidents, and labeling (e.g. crybaby, wise guy, stupid, dreamer).

Ginott (1974) expresses the belief that teachers resort to blame, shame, rebuke, reproach, threat and punishment daily. He cites the following list of destructive utterances observed to flow from a fifth grade teacher in a single day (p. 106):

> Why can't you be good for a change?
> Why are you so selfish?
> Why do you have to fight with everybody?
> Why can't you be like the other children?
> Why must you interrupt everybody?
> Why can't you keep your mouth shut once in awhile?
> Why are you so slow?
> Why do you always rush?
> Why must you be such a pest?
> Why are you so disorganized?
> Why are you such a busybody?
> Why do you forget everything I tell you?
> Why are you so stupid?

Ginott (1974) maintains that as long as teachers are motivated by personal pique and private vendettas, they will invite counter-vengeance, with students interpreting their responses as justification of past misbehavior, and an excuse for further offense.

It is evident from the foregoing, that teachers and teacher educators are in fairly good agreement as to the shortcomings of current practice, and the need for change, if not regarding solutions. This should not be surprising,

as Dunkin and Biddle (1974) remind us that research in education to date has tended to tell us more about what not to do in teaching than what to do.

Authenticity in Teacher-Student Relationships

In their revolutionary book Teaching as a Subversive Activity, Postman and Weingartner (1969) maintain that if schools and teachers do not seem to be doing what needs to be done, this can and must be changed. They believe that students tend to learn most readily the behaviors they see enacted by their teachers. As Charles Bidwell (1973, p. 414) points out "in its aims teaching is coterminous with socialization." If we are dissatisfied with destructive teacher responses to provocation in the classroom, and if we believe that such responses promote a cycle of retaliation, then we ought to direct our attention to intervening in this cycle in such a way that teachers begin to function as more desirable role models interpersonally.

Carl Rogers, in Freedom to Learn (1969), has called for a significant change in the psychological climate in schools, a movement toward freedom, communication and self-reliance for teachers and students. He describes teachers as facilitators of learning, and he maintains that the quality of this facilitation depends entirely on the personal relationship existing between the facilitator and the learner. Rogers suggests that teachers ought to pay as much attention to their relationships with students as to content material. He

believes that teachers who are skilled facilitators will be more inclined to work out interpersonal frictions and problems with students directly, in a self-disclosing way, rather than dealing with such issues in a punitive manner.

Truax and Carkhuff (1967) also speak of a need for teacher-student relationships to grow in the direction of greater authenticity or genuineness. They recommend that teachers enter directly into personal encounters with students and express the feelings and attitudes they are experiencing.

A similar view is set forth by Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) who stress that the most effective communication between two human beings is direct and honest communication. They cite the work of Aspy (1965), who studied the differential effects of high and low functioning teachers on student achievement with 120 third graders, matched for sex and IQ. Aspy found that teachers who offered high levels of congruence created conditions conducive to greater student achievement.

Vander Kolk (1975) maintains that little has been done to prepare teachers for their humanistic role in the classroom. Yet, there appears to be considerable agreement in the education literature (Carnot, 1973; Chamberlain and Weinberger, 1971; McCarthy, 1975; Mixer and Milson, 1973; Vander Kolk, 1975; Winston, 1976) of a need for teachers to move toward greater humanism and genuineness in their relationships with students. McCarthy (1975) for example, maintains that, while teachers have by and large relinquished corporal punishment, all too often it has been replaced by

tumultuous verbal criticisms which humiliate children in front of their peers.

There are some indications that humanistic pupil control ideology (as measured by the Pupil Control Ideology Form developed by Willower, Eidell and Hoy, described in Halpin, Goldenberg and Halpin, 1973) correlates well with other teacher characteristics which are believed to be positive. For example, Jones and Blankenship (1972) studied the relationship of 68 biology teachers' pupil control and classroom practice, and found that teachers with more humanistic as opposed to custodial pupil control ideology were more suited to institute innovative science programs. Halpin, Goldenberg and Halpin (1973) studied the relationship of creativity (as measured by Torrence Tests of Creative Thinking) and pupil control ideology in 99 student teachers enrolled in teacher education classes at the University of Georgia. They found that less creative potential teachers were more authoritarian in their pupil control ideology and tended to relate to students in an impersonal manner. Also, Brenneman, Willower and Lynch (1975) investigated a group of 276 public school teachers in Pennsylvania, comparing their level of self-acceptance and acceptance of others (using Berger's instrument) to their pupil control ideology. They found that high levels of acceptance of others correlated well with humanistic pupil control ideology. However, self-acceptance appeared to be unrelated to pupil control ideology. This latter findin~ is surprising, in that others (Cangemi and

Khan, 1973; Purkey and Avila, 1971) have found that teachers who discipline effectively tend to have positive self concepts. There is some indication that teachers who see themselves as capable and competent are less inclined to perceive student misbehavior as a personal insult to them (Cangemi and Khan, 1973; Purkey and Avila, 1971).

One particularly disturbing finding emerged from a project by Hoy (1968), when he conducted a longitudinal study of 175 student teachers over a one-year period. He found that teachers at both the elementary and secondary school levels showed significantly more custodial pupil control ideology after each successive period of teaching experience. He concluded that the process of socialization within the school subculture is an important influence in reshaping the pupil control ideology of beginning teachers.

Thomas Gordon (1974) challenges teachers to risk becoming more authentic in their relationships with students - to risk allowing students to know them more intimately, as persons capable of feeling disappointment, hurt, anger and fear. He believes that such genuine self-disclosure on the part of teachers, will allow students to perceive them as real people - people with whom they can have meaningful relationships.

Strategies for Teacher Management of Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom

Many different approaches to the management of disruptive behavior in the classroom have been offered over the years.

A brief review of some of these methods will be presented here, along with several authors' definitions of disruptive pupil behavior.

Definitions of Disruptive Behavior

Driscoll (1971) set forth to identify the pupil disruptive behaviors that student teachers perceive to be the most frequent and the most serious. He surveyed 664 student teachers from Michigan State University during their final session, and identified the following list of behaviors as the most frequent disruptive behaviors:

- whispering
- failing to follow directions
- making noise
- talking out
- daydreaming
- reading or writing while teacher is talking
- chewing gum
- clicking pens

Alschuler and Shea (1974), cooperating in a joint university-junior high school, two year project in Massachusetts, observed the following disruptive behaviors to be those indulged in most frequently by their students:

- communicating to other students, unrelated to lesson (e.g. talking, whispering, lip-reading, note passing)
- verbally abusing other students (e.g. teasing, threatening)
- putting down the teacher (e.g. mumbling, shrugging, grimacing)

- complaining about orders (e.g. "Someone else started it" or "I didn't do anything.")
- making physical contact with other students (e.g. brushing, pushing, hitting, throwing object)
- moving around (e.g. getting up to sharpen pencil or throw something in wastebasket, changing seat)
- making noise (e.g. tapping foot, drumming on desk, playing imaginary harmonica, snapping cigarette lighter, giggling, crumpling paper, banging teeth with pencil)
- making solitary escape (ignoring, daydreaming, combing hair, sleeping)
- intruding (coming in late, making funny faces through doorway window)
- forgetting or not having materials
- declaring independence (refusing to obey apparent unjust or demeaning order)

Chiu (1975) employed the 'critical' incident technique in order to determine 85 student teachers' perceptions of discipline problems in the elementary school classroom. They identified the following 7 categories of misbehavior as repeated most frequently:

- talking
- aggressiveness (e.g. hitting, tripping)
- work not done or incomplete
- inattentiveness
- disobeyed instructions
- misused school property

- stealing or using without permission

Of the above behaviors, the first two (talking and aggressiveness), accounted for 80 percent of the incidents described by these student teachers.

One further relevant study was conducted by Kass and Drabman (1970) of the State University of New York. They studied the disruptive behaviors of two particularly disruptive second-grade students over a four-month period. They found that a modified version of O'Leary and Becker's (1967) categories of disruptive behavior were suitable for itemizing the behaviors they observed from these boys. Their modified categories are:

- out of chair behavior
- touching others' property
- vocalization
- playing
- orienting (turning around in chair)
- noise
- aggression
- time off task

It would appear, from the foregoing, that there is considerable agreement regarding what constitutes disruptive behavior in the classroom, with the most common behaviors appearing to be activities which are interruptive, either to the teacher or to other pupils in the class.

Behavior Therapy Approaches to Disruptive Classroom Behavior

Behavior technology has much to offer teachers wishing to modify maladaptive pupil classroom behavior. Many authors (Goodall, 1972; Greenberg and O'Donnell, 1972; Kirschner and Levin, 1975; O'Keefe and Smaby, 1973; Rimm and Masters, 1974; Rudner, 1973) have reported successful application of behavior modification techniques in teaching children appropriate classroom behavior. Some of these techniques are contingency management, extinction, behavioral contracting, assertive training, modeling, and behavior rehearsal. Each of these methods will be briefly discussed, the latter three, under the section dealing with program development.

"Contingency management consists of the contingent presentation and withdrawal of rewards and punishments" (Rimm and Masters, 1974, p. 166). The use of this method in the classroom necessitates careful identification of the behavior to be changed, and of the reinforcers which may be manipulated effectively for the particular child involved, as well as those reinforcers which are presently maintaining the maladaptive behaviors (Rimm and Masters, 1974).

Contingency management, with the use of positive reinforcers was employed by Kirschner and Levin (1975) in an attempt to alter the aggressive behavior of a group of 10 to 13 year old boys. The boys received check marks from their teachers for good behavior, and were able to exchange these check marks for meeting time with the group, the purchase of games from the psychologist, or having a 'good'

letter sent to their parents. Also, once the group of boys as a whole earned sufficient points, they could choose a field trip to such places as a local TV station or a miniature golf course. These positive reinforcers proved to be very powerful in increasing the frequency of non-aggressive target behaviors, and these improvements were shown to be maintained over time.

"Extinction is the term used to describe the relatively permanent unlearning of a behavior (the elimination of a behavior from a person's repertoire)" (Rimm and Masters, 1974, p. 195). It is believed that extinction will occur when reinforcement of a behavior ceases. Consequently, if a teacher can manage to consistently not reinforce undesirable behavior, it should eventually diminish, after an initial increase in frequency and intensity (O'Keefe and Smaby, 1973). The difficulty with effective use of extinction principles in the classroom, however, rests with the fact that many powerful reinforcers are not under the control of the teacher, rather, they are manipulated by the students themselves (O'Keefe and Smaby, 1973). The study of Kirschner and Levin (1975), referred to previously, also incorporated extinction procedures to decrease the aggressive behavior of 10 to 13 year old boys. The boys' teachers were carefully instructed and rehearsed, not to reinforce aggressive behavior in the classroom by saying such things as "Stop that" or "You know better," etc. It is often recommended (Cahoon and Wenrich, 1970; O'Keefe and Smaby, 1973; Rimm and Masters, 1974) that such

extinction procedures be coupled with the concurrent reinforcement of the desired behaviors. In Kirschner and Levin's (1975) study, this was done by having the boys' teachers, read and implement the suggestions made by Tinsley and Ora (1970), in their article "Catch the Child Being Good."

"Behavior contracting is an agreement between two parties which specifies: (1) a requirement to be met (a task), and (2) the consequences for filling that requirement (a reward). This agreement can be stated in a conditional sentence, 'If you will do the task, then you will receive the reward.'" (Willson, 1976, p. 7). Behavior contracting has been shown to be very effective in reducing inappropriate behaviors and increasing on task behaviors in elementary school classrooms (Anandam and Williams, 1971; Brigham and Amith, 1973; Dee, 1972; Frost, 1973; Meisels, 1974). O'Keefe and Smaby (1973) cite instances of its effective use in high schools as well, and they emphasize the involvement of a variety of significant persons, (e.g. teachers, parents, and other students). Kirschner and Levin (1975) incorporated a behavior contract, along with the other methods mentioned above, in their work with 10 to 13 year old aggressive boys. A sample of this contract would be:

> I (student's name) agree to try to stop fighting and threatening other kids in my class. Each morning and afternoon that I do not fight or threaten, my teacher will give me a check (✓). Every (day of the week) I will have a chance to meet with (psychologist). At these meetings, I can buy the following things with my checks:

1. 3 checks allow me to meet with my group and (psychologist).
2. 7 checks or more allow me to buy a game, model, ball or other thing from (psychologist). I can also save my checks to buy a more expensive toy or game.
3. 8 checks or more in one week will earn me a good letter sent home to my parents.

Student signs _____

Psychologist signs _____

(Kirschner and Levin, 1973, p. 203)

The above discussion represents a brief and incomplete review of behavior therapy approaches to disruptive behavior in the classroom. More thorough reviews are available in such sources as Rimm and Masters (1974) and Baird et al. (1972).

Adlerian Approach to Management of Disruptive Classroom Behavior

Rudolph Dreikurs is one of the major modern proponents of Adlerian psychology, or Individual Psychology, as it is called by some. He founded and directed the Alfred Adler Institute in Chicago and also founded the Journal of Individual Psychology. Dreikurs has adapted Adler's theories for use by parents and teachers, and has expounded these theories in numerous books and other publications, the most relevant of which, for teachers, is Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom (Dreikurs, Grunwald, and Pepper, 1971). Dreikurs maintains that all behavior is goal directed, and that generally these goals are concerned with belonging to a group. Children's misbehavior is seen as an indication of discouragement, and is perceived to result from the child's pursuit of one of the four following goals:

1. Attention seeking - the child may engage in a variety of acceptable and unacceptable behaviors to gain attention and thereby feel significant.
2. Power - the child who acts out to gain attention, frequently meets with adult attempts to suppress and control him. Inevitably a power struggle between adult and child results.
3. Revenge - the child who is unable to gain feelings of significance by means of getting attention or through power struggles, will ultimately resort to revenge, hurting other people as he feels hurt by them.
4. Display of Deficiencies - the child may eventually try to avoid further humiliation and embarrassment by withdrawing from participation and seeking to be left alone. This is the ultimate indication of a discouraged child.

(Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper, 1971)

Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper (1971) go on to outline how teachers can learn to recognize the immediate goals of the child, and the resulting consequences of his misbehavior. They attempt to teach teachers how to obtain a "recognition reflex" from a misbehaving child, by hypothesizing to the child possible goals of his behavior (e.g. "Could it be that you're doing that to keep the teacher busy with you?"), and carefully observing the child for indications that he recognizes the stated goal to be correct (e.g. the child may emit a knowing smile, laughter or a twinkle in the eye, etc.).

Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper (1971) stress the importance of teachers learning skills of responding to immediate disruptions in constructive ways, and they give many examples of teacher interventions tailored to the particular goals of the child's misbehavior (see Dreikurs, Grunwald and Pepper, 1971, pp. 29-30).

Dreikurs is perhaps best known for his emphasis on natural and logical consequences (Dreikurs, 1971, 1972; Dreikurs and Cassel, 1973; Dreikurs and Grey, 1968) in shaping behavior. He maintains that children ought to experience the natural outcomes of their misbehavior (e.g. if work is unfinished, the child is not ready to move into the play period), and when natural consequences are unsafe or impractical, that adults ought to arrange logical consequences which would serve as deterrents (e.g. if the child is not careful with special classroom equipment, he is not capable of using it) (Dreikurs, 1971).

Dreikurs (1971) also supports the use of role playing, and problem solving discussions in dealing with episodes of misbehavior in the classroom.

Ginott's Method of Handling Disruptive Classroom Behavior

Haim Ginott (1972, a) expresses the opinion that teachers frequently become angry in the classroom, yet feel guilty and troubled by these feelings, believing that 'good' teachers would not be provoked to anger. Ginott maintains that enlightened teachers recognize that their anger responses are normal and natural. He feels that the emphasis should be placed

on how to express anger in the classroom, rather than debating whether or not it should be expressed (Ginott, 1972, b).

Ginott (1972, b) calls for congruent teacher communication, which he defines as "communication that is harmonious, authentic; where words fit feelings" (p. 79). He believes that "every teacher can acquire competence and caution in communication, and become less abrasive and less provocative" (p. 77). He places emphasis on the quality of the teacher-student relationship, and the powerful impact of personal statements from the teacher. He states (Holt, Ginott, Salk and Barr, 1972) that typical teacher responses to provocation are destructive and arouse revenge fantasies in children, whereas congruent teacher responses have the potential of teaching children that all feelings are legitimate (Snider and Murphy, 1975).

Ginott's (1972, b) style of intervention might be characterized as 'anger without insult'. Essentially, he makes the following suggestions to teachers regarding their response to provoking students in the classroom:

1. address the child's situation, not his personality or character (e.g. "The books are on the floor. They need to be picked up," not "You are so messy," or "You are irresponsible.").
2. send 'I' messages rather than 'you' messages (e.g. "I am appalled," "I am annoyed," "I am furious," not "You are a pest," "Look what you've done," "You are so stupid.").

Ginott (1972, a) stresses that when teachers genuinely express anger, children tend to be very attentive, and often respond with compliance, out of surprise. One questions then, if this method might lose its effectiveness over time as the surprise element disappears.

Ginott has been criticized by Holt (Holt, Ginott, Salk and Bau, 1972) who contends that Ginott's approach makes the misbehaving child the centre of the teacher's attention, and consequently can lead to lengthy diversions. He flatly states that such negotiating does not belong in the classroom.

Ginott is also criticized by Jensen (1975), who argues that teachers should withhold their responses from students when they are experiencing anger. He maintains that it is preferable for teachers to wait until they feel they can be neutral or congenial before approaching students regarding incidents of misbehavior.

Application of Kounin's Research Findings Regarding Disruptive Classroom Behaviors

Kounin (1970) describes the results of three intensive studies of classroom observation, which in total involved 105 elementary school teachers, and observation periods spanning 168 full teaching days. Kounin has been commended by Ginott (1972, a) and Dunkin and Biddle (1974) for the originality of concepts used, the sophistication of observational methods, the high reliability of coding judgements, and the strong relationships detected between teacher and pupil variables.

Kounin (1970) and his associates were interested in determining what teachers do differently in classrooms with high work involvement and low misbehavior versus classrooms with low work involvement and high misbehavior. They were able to identify certain categories of teacher style and behavior which correlated significantly with children's behavior in the classroom. These categories are briefly summarized by Ginott (1972, a) as follows:

"Withitness"

An effective teacher demonstrates that he knows what is going on in the classroom. He does not pick on the wrong child for a deviant act of another. He singles out the initiator, not the onlooker, or victim. He lives up to the proverbial picture of having "eyes in the back of his head."

"Overlapping"

An effective teacher can attend to two issues simultaneously. While Mary was reading, two boys in the seatwork area were talking. The teacher said, "Mary, continue reading. I'm listening, " and almost instantly said to the boys, "I can hear you talk. Now turn around and do your seatwork."

This teacher took care of two issues without fuss and without loss of time and temper. In contrast, an ineffective teacher becomes immersed in a minor misbehavior, while dropping the main activity.

"Movement Management"

In each classroom, children move physically (as from desk to reading circle) and psychologically (as from arithmetic to spelling). How teachers initiate, maintain, and terminate such moves significantly affects discipline in the classroom. Kounin's research shows that ineffective teachers overtalk and fail to maintain momentum in movements.

"Group Focus"

Effective teachers focus on the group. During recitations they do not become immersed in one child. They have at their disposal a variety of techniques for alerting the class.

(Ginott, 1972, a, pp. 174-179)

Dunkin and Biddle (1974) point out some shortcomings of Kounin's work, in that no attempt has been made to relate the identified teacher variables with student achievement. Also, to date, it is not known whether or not teachers could be taught to improve their managerial styles in the direction of Kounin's research findings. However, Dunkin and Biddle (1974) suggest that "Kounin's research holds considerable promise for the eventual improvement of classroom teaching" (p. 161).

Gordon's Approach to Management of Disruptive Classroom Behaviors

Gordon (1974) suggests that a unique kind of relationship must exist between teachers and students, if teaching-learning processes are to work effectively--some kind of connection, link or bridge. In his book Teaching Effectiveness Training, he devotes considerable content to the development of these connections or links, which he perceives to be facilitated by communication skills.

Gordon (1974) maintains that teachers rely far too heavily on disciplining by means of punishment, blaming and shaming (see discussion of typical teacher responses presented earlier in this chapter), and he challenges them to develop skill in nonpower methods in order to achieve discipline and order. He suggests that in doing so, teachers would need to familiarize themselves with a new language in talking about discipline. For example, the traditional language of power, exemplified by such words as control, direct, policing, enforcing, laying down the law, reprimanding, etc. would be replaced by such

terms as confrontation, collaboration, conflict resolution, problem solving, negotiating, mutual agreements, working things through, etc.

Gordon (1974) carefully differentiates between student and teacher-owned problems. When dealing with student-owned problems, such as poor achievement, discouragement, personal defeat, etc., he recommends that teachers allow students to initiate and supply the direction in resolution. He feels that the teacher in this situation is operating as a listener and counsellor who is primarily interested in the student's needs. Conversely, when the teacher identifies a problem as a teacher-owned problem (e.g. interruption, tardiness, forgetfulness) Gordon contends that a quite different approach is called for. Here the teacher ought to initiate communication on the subject, and be active in the problem solving process, moving toward a solution satisfactory to himself. In this instance, Gordon feels that the teacher is legitimate in being concerned primarily with his own needs.

When a situation has been identified as one in which the teacher owns the problem (i.e. a situation in which student behavior actually or potentially interferes with the teacher's legitimate needs), Gordon (1974) suggests that the teacher send what he calls an "I-Message." An "I-Message" facilitates the teacher retaining responsibility for his own feelings and behavior, while leaving the student responsible for his feelings and behavior. According to Gordon (1974) "I-Messages" have three essential components:

1. Stating what is creating a problem for the teacher (e.g. a non-blaming, non-judgemental description of what is unacceptable).
2. Pinning down the tangible or concrete effect that the specific behavior described has on the teacher (e.g. how is the student's behavior interfering with the teacher's needs).
3. Stating the feelings generated within the teacher because he is tangibly affected (e.g. the genuine feeling experienced by the teacher in this situation, whether this is fear, disappointment, hurt, frustration, etc.).

Gordon (1974), unlike Ginott (1972, a) cautions teachers against expressing anger in their "I-Messages". In fact, Gordon describes anger as a secondary emotion which always follows a primary one. He encourages teachers to look beneath the surface when they experience anger, and attempt to identify what the primary feeling is, in order to include this primary feeling in their "I-Message". He admits that such a process may leave the teacher in a vulnerable position (discussed in more detail in the section regarding authenticity in teacher-student relationships, earlier in this chapter) however, he reports that teachers who persist with this method, eventually find students themselves sending more honest messages.

Carducci (1976) has demonstrated the effectiveness of "I-Messages," in reducing the frequency of disruptive behavior with 64 fifth grade students. Teachers trained to use "I-Messages" experienced significantly less disruptive behavior

even though these messages were delivered at a low frequency rate. This study also demonstrated that the use of "I-Messages" was superior to the use of teacher commands, in reducing the frequency of disruptive behavior.

Program Development

Objectives

Anderson and Faust (1973) stress the importance of identification and proper statement of educational objectives in the early stages of lesson or program development. They maintain that the clear statement of objectives makes teachers more effective, by clarifying goals and providing criteria against which to evaluate learning.

Mager (1962) has been a particularly prominent force in specifying the necessary components of properly stated objectives. These components are:

1. an indication of what the performance is
2. an indication of the conditions under which the performance will take place
3. an indication of the minimal level of acceptable performance

Mager (1962) and Gronlund (1970) emphasize the importance of stating instructional objectives in terms of learning outcomes and in terms of student rather than teacher performance.

Nicholls and Nicholls (1972) stress the need for making use of carefully stated objectives to dictate the content, materials and methods to be used in facilitating learning.

Modeling

Albert Bandura (1977) maintains that most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling. This observational learning, he suggests, is governed by the following component processes:

1. attentional processes - attention to models will depend on the interpersonal attraction of the models, the salience and complexity of the modeled behaviors, and the perceptual set of the observer.
2. retention processes - retention of modeled activities will depend on attention, ability to code, and presence of vivid imagery on the part of the learner
3. motor reproduction processes - behavioral enactment of modeled behavior will depend on the observer's ability to convert symbolic representations into appropriate action, monitor these actions, and refine them on the basis of informative feedback.
4. motivational processes - observers are more likely to adopt modeled bahavior if it results in outcomes they value, than if it has unrewarding or punishing effects.

Modeling has been shown to be an effective technique in facilitating the learning of complex new responses in a wide variety of areas, from altruism (Bryan and Brickman, 1973; Yarrow, Scott and Waxler, 1973), to moral judgement orientations (Bandura and McDonald, 1963; Keasey, 1973; Prentice, 1972; Sarason and Ganzer, 1973), to conceptual behavior (Zigler and Yando, 1972; Zimmerman and Rosenthal, 1972) and perceptual judgements (Davidson and Liebert, 1972).

More specifically, modeling has been demonstrated to be an effective method of teaching adults to modify affective responses. For example, Perry (1975) compared the use of verbal instructions and audio-tape modeling of empathic counsellor responses, in training a group of 66 clergymen. She found that while presence of instructions augmented learning, the critical factor was exposure to modeling tapes.

Eskedal (1975), in working with 56 students enrolled in a master's level counseling course at Suffolk University concluded that brief videotaped presentations by a symbolic role model were effective in increasing students' level of specific knowledge about the initial counseling relationship.

In another recent study, McGuire, Helen and Amolsch (1975) compared the effects of modeled versus descriptive instructions in assisting 60 male undergraduate students to learn the skill of self-disclosure. They concluded that the subjects' level of disclosure increased as a function of length of exposure to modeling videotapes but not as a function of length of exposure to videotaped descriptive instructions.

In a somewhat similar study, Robinson (1974) compared the effectiveness of behavioral versus verbal modeling in teaching college students assertive behaviors, finding the behavioral modeling to be more influential.

Lehman (1974) has also demonstrated the usefulness of modeling in facilitating the development of empathy in high school tutors.

Despite these indications of the value of modeling in facilitating modification of interpersonal response patterns, there does not appear to be reports in the education literature of application of modeling techniques with teachers.

Apparently, the issue of live versus symbolic models is not a particularly important one (Bandura, 1970, 1977). It has been shown that adults can effectively acquire attitudes, emotional responses and new styles of conduct via filmed modeling (Bandura, 1973; O'Connor, 1969, 1972; Wolf and Cheyne, 1972). In fact, Eisler, Hersen and Miller (1973) point out several advantages of filmed over live models--the opportunity for careful rehearsal, and accurate repetition.

Role Playing

Bandura (1977) suggests that behavioral rehearsal serves as an important aid to memory, following observation of symbolic modeling. He states that "the highest level of observational learning is achieved by first organizing and rehearsing the modeled behavior symbolically, and then enacting it overtly" (p. 27).

Rachman (1972) concludes that the positive impact of modeling can be enhanced by a combination of audio and visual presentations, repeated practice, prolonged exposure times, the use of multiple models, participant modeling, and the use of relaxation training.

It is surprising that role playing or behavior rehearsal has not been more widely used in the education of teachers

(Fink, 1973; McFall and Marsten, 1970). It appears to hold considerable potential for shaping interpersonal responses (Friedman, 1972), particularly when combined with modeling (Bandura and Jeffrey, 1973; Berger, 1966; Friedman, 1971; Gittelman, 1965).

Assertive Training

"Assertive behavior is interpersonal behavior involving the honest and relatively straightforward expression of feeling. Simply stated, assertive training includes any therapeutic procedure aimed at increasing the client's ability to engage in such behavior in a socially appropriate manner" (Rimm and Masters, 1974, p. 81).

While numerous studies appear, making use of assertive training with children in school situations (reviewed by Rudner, 1976), this author was unable to locate instances of assertive training for teachers. Yet, in light of much of the foregoing literature review, it would seem appropriate to initiate such studies directed toward classroom teachers.

Eisler et al. (1975) and Sansbury (1974) have pointed out that assertive responding in fact involves the coordination of a variety of verbal and nonverbal behaviors, that is, developing assertiveness is a complex undertaking. Often the techniques employed to teach assertion are equally involved (Eisler, Hersen and Miller, 1973; Friedman, 1971; Hersen, Eisler and Miller, 1973; Rathus, 1972) incorporating such things as modeling, instruction, performance feedback and behavior rehearsal. Modeling techniques have been shown

to be particularly useful in teaching persons to respond assertively (Bandura, 1973), even when modeling is presented symbolically via videotaping (Eisler, Hersen and Miller, 1973; Miller, 1973; Rathus, 1973).

Fensterheim and Baer (1975) have described the following four characteristics of the truly assertive person:

1. He feels free to reveal himself. Through words and actions he makes the statement, "This is me. This is what I feel, think and want!"

2. He can communicate with people on all levels--with strangers, friends, family. This communication is always open, direct, honest, appropriate.

3. He has an active orientation to life. He goes after what he wants. In contrast to the passive person who waits for things to happen, he attempts to make things happen.

4. He acts in a way he himself respects. Aware that he cannot always win, he accepts his limitations. However, he always strives to make the good try so that win, lose or draw, he maintains his self-respect.

(Fensterheim and Baer, 1975, p. 20)

It seems likely that such characteristics as those described above, would be desirable for classroom teachers. As Rimm and Masters (1974) are careful to point out, what is advocated in assertive training is not unreflective and spontaneous emoting, but rather, honest feeling expression, tempered with a knowledge of likely interpersonal consequences, and a sensitivity to the rights of others. In this respect, the goals of assertive training appear to align well with Gordon's (1974) method of intervening with provoking students in the classroom.

Summary

The ideas discussed throughout this chapter, in relation to the: limited nature of typical teacher responses to provocation; the need for greater authenticity in teacher-student relationships; the approaches to management of disruptive classroom behaviors; and the value of modeling, behavior rehearsal and assertive training in modifying behavior; provided the impetus for the present study. It is the opinion of this author, that teachers and students would benefit from teachers learning to respond more genuinely in relating to students, and that programs should be developed to that end.

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF TREATMENT PROGRAM

This chapter focuses on the phases of workshop development, and presents a detailed description of the workshop itself.

Development

The literature review, in Chapter II, supports the need for a program designed to assist teachers to learn more effective methods of responding to provocation in the classroom. The author found the contributions of Rogers, Carkhuff, Gordon and Ginott, and the various authors dealing with behavioral teaching strategies (see literature review, Chapter II) particularly useful in developing the workshop.

The following objectives were identified for the workshop:

General Objective

To facilitate teachers learning an appropriate method of intervening when students provoke them in the classroom.

Specific Objectives

To assist teachers to:

1. Consider alternate ways of handling provoking classroom situations, other than by venting anger or controlling expression of feelings.
2. To identify classroom situations which they personally find provoking.
3. Develop a cognitive understanding of Gordon's method of intervening in provoking situations.
4. Demonstrate behaviors consistent with Gordon's method of intervening in provoking situations.

This statement of objectives indicates the author's belief that the teachers participating in the workshop must first develop a feeling that they personally may benefit from learning an alternate response, to add to their repertoire. Care was taken in introducing the objectives, to emphasize that the method of intervention being focused on, was not being presented as the best or only way of dealing with provoking situations.

In developing the workshop, an attempt was made to use time efficiently, and to develop a format which could be quite readily implemented by others (e.g. undergraduate teachers, school counsellors, etc.). The workshop incorporates a brief theoretical presentation, modeling of the recommended teacher response to provocation, and role playing of provoking classroom incidents (see Figure 1). Attempts were made to use situations relevant to the workshop participants.

Selection of Provoking Situations

In developing the provoking classroom incidents to be used for the role playing sessions, the modeling tape, and the test situations, application was made of the typical teacher responses to provocation identified in the literature review (see Chapter II). Also, an attempt was made to increase the likelihood of selecting situations relevant to workshop participants, and to avoid choosing unnecessarily simple or complex incidents by consulting with some local teachers. The author visited two Edmonton elementary and junior high

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

WORKSHOP FORMAT

General Introduction and Objectives of the Workshop	15 minutes
Viewing of Modeling Tapes and Discussion	30 minutes
Essential Components of Teacher Response to Student Provocation	15 minutes
COFFEE BREAK	
Examples of Provoking Situations from Workshop Participants	15 minutes
Role Play Practice in Small Groups	1 hour
Summary and Feedback	15 minutes
Written Evaluation of Workshop and Test	20 minutes

Figure 1.

schools, and through informal discussion with approximately a dozen teachers, elicited a number of real-life situations which occurred recently in these teachers' classrooms, and which these teachers believed to be common.

Preparation of the Modeling Tape

Two different models were selected to portray teachers, one male and one female, in order to facilitate the participants (male and female teachers) identifying with these models. The two models selected had previous experience in modeling effective teacher behaviors to groups of teachers.

Three situations were chosen on the basis of insights gained from the literature review (see Chapter II), and input from local teachers. These situations focused on: (1) a student interrupting her teacher who is attempting to give instructions, (2) a student who refuses to do as his teacher requests, and (3) two students who are fighting between themselves.

A decision was made to model a 'typical' (but less effective) method of handling the provoking situation, as well as the method recommended in the workshop. This decision was based on the hope, that in watching the 'typical' response presented, the participants would indeed acknowledge the need for alternatives. The contrast was also included in order to clarify the differences between 'typical' responses, and the response being presented as more desirable.

Two students were selected to participate in the modeling tape, a twelve year old girl, and a fourteen year old boy.

These students were chosen on the basis of their demonstrated ability to act, and their interest in participating in the project.

Description

General Introduction and Objectives of the Workshop

(Time Required - 15 minutes)

After welcoming the participants to the workshop, and having them share some information regarding their teaching experience, the workshop facilitator made the following introductory comments:

Teachers at times encounter classroom situations (students who are forgetful, interrupt, don't pay attention, etc.), which arouse feelings of frustration, irritation and anger, and they deal with these situations in a variety of ways. Thomas Gordon's research in teacher effectiveness, however, has revealed that 90-95% of such teacher responses to provoking situations, involve some negative evaluation of the student and foster resistance to change. Hence, he suggests the need for teachers to learn to confront provoking students in ways which have a lower probability of damaging the student's self-esteem, and at the same time, a higher probability of influencing them to modify their own behavior. Gordon has found that when children are told (in an honest and non-blaming way) how their behavior affects the teacher, they are generally surprised, and they respond more often than teachers would imagine, simply out of consideration for their teacher's needs.

This workshop will focus on Gordon's method of confronting provoking students, a method which fosters an honest expression of feeling from the teacher, and lets the student know just how his behavior is interfering with the teacher's needs. Yet, the responsibility for formulating a response to the teacher's confrontation remains clearly with the student, in that the teacher does not tell the student what he should feel or do. This is not a matter of teachers simply learning to vent anger towards students, as venting anger tends to make students more aggressive and reactive in return.

Gordon recommends that teachers examine their feelings and try to identify their responses to particular provoking situations in the classroom. He maintains that many other feelings frequently accompany anger. For example, the teacher may experience hurt, frustration, embarrassment, discouragement, insult or disappointment as the primary feeling when provoked, yet may habitually attempt to control all expression of feeling, or respond with angry feelings which blame, ridicule, embarrass or criticize the student.

The method of confrontation being focused on in this workshop necessitates authentic self disclosure on the part of the teacher, and consequently, requires teachers to identify what their feeling response is in the particular situation, and to share these feelings with the student concerned, without insulting them or putting them down. This method of dealing with provoking situations, assists students to perceive their teachers as real people with their own needs, people with whom

they can have meaningful relationships.

The facilitator then distributed copies of the above text, and copies of the objectives of the workshop (see section on program development above, for objectives). Objectives were discussed and elaborated, and participants indicated that they were interested in pursuing these objectives.

Viewing of Modeling Tapes and Discussion

(Time Required - 30 minutes)

At this point in the program the modeling tape[1] was introduced, and the workshop participants received written guides for viewing the tape segments. The guide for viewing the 'typical' but undesirable intervention segments consisted of the questions:

1. What things did the teacher say or do that may have caused the student to feel insulted or put down?
2. How might the teacher have handled this situation differently?

Participants' responses to these stimulus questions, as well as other self-initiated responses (e.g. comments on teaching style portrayed) served as the basis of discussion after observation of each 'typical' teacher response segment.

The guide for viewing the recommended teacher intervention method, consisted of the following questions:

1. Was there a genuine expression of feeling by the teacher? If so, what feelings were expressed?

---

[1]This modeling tape is available from Dr. Peter Calder, Educational Psychology Department, University of Alberta.

2. What was unacceptable to the teacher?
3. Did the teacher say what effect the student's behavior had on her?
4. In what ways did the teacher focus on the student?
5. Was the student given an opportunity to respond?

Participants' responses to these stimulus questions, as well as self-initiated responses, served as the basis of discussion following the observation of each segment portraying the recommended method of teacher intervention. It was anticipated that these particular questions would be instrumental in facilitating a personal recognition of elements of effective teacher response to provocation.

Essential Components of Teacher Response to Provocation in the Classroom

(Time Required - 15 minutes)

At this point in the workshop, the facilitator distributed the following list of five essential components of teacher response to provocation in the classroom, adapted from Gordon (1974).

1. State the problem (i.e. what is the student doing that is unacceptable?).
2. State what effect this problem has on the teacher.
3. Express the feelings generated in the teacher.
4. Focus on the student (e.g. eye contact, use of the student's name, movement toward the student, etc.).
5. Give the student an opportunity to respond.

These components were discussed and elaborated with examples from the facilitator and the participants themselves. These

components of teacher response were then transcribed on a blackboard, and participants were urged to use them as criteria for their own performance in the role playing episodes to be engaged in later.

Prior to coffee break, the facilitator briefly explained that since role play practice was to be part of the workshop, it was desirable to obtain relevant, real-life experiences from the participants themselves, as the basis of this role playing. Guides for recording these incidents were distributed at this time, in hopes that some informal discussion may be generated on this topic over the break period.

Examples of Provoking Behavior in the Classroom

(Time Required - 15 minutes)

Teacher participants were given three copies of a guide (see Figure 2), and were urged to record specifically what occurred in the particular incidents described, using behavioral terminology.

Role Play Practice in Small Groups

(Time Required - 1 hour)

Participants were requested to divide into groups of three and to designate one member as the teacher, one as the student, and one as an observer, in each situation role played. They were further instructed to rotate these roles with each situation role played so that all participants would experience several trials in each role. Participants were given guides (see Figure 3) for use in their observer role.

EXAMPLES OF PROVOKING BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM

Please describe an incident which has occurred in your classroom which caused you to feel frustrated, irritated, or angry with a student or students.

1. Describe the context of the provoking incident (e.g. class activity at the time, what happened just before, grade level).

2. What exactly did the student do or say that was provoking? (Include nonverbal behavior.)

3. What was the teacher's reaction? (Include nonverbal behavior.)

4. Describe the outcome.

Figure 2.

OBSERVER GUIDE FOR ROLE PLAY SITUATIONS

1. Did the teacher state what the problem behavior was?
   Yes ____
   No ____

2. Did the teacher state what effect this behavior had on her/him? Yes ____
   No ____

3. Did the teacher express her/his feelings?
   Yes ____
   No ____

   If so, did she/he do so in a non-blaming way? Yes ____
   No ____

   in a genuine way? Yes ____
   No ____

4. Did the teacher focus on the student concerned?
   Yes ____
   No ____

   How did the teacher demonstrate this?

5. Did the teacher give the student an opportunity to respond?
   Yes ____
   No ____

6. Other comments?

Figure 3.

The facilitator's role throughout this segment of the program consisted of circulating among the role playing groups, providing suggestions to participants, particularly those assuming the teacher's role, and attempting to give support and encouragement for role playing efforts.

Summary and Feedback -

(Time Required - 15 minutes)

This time was devoted to a sharing of experiences from the small groups, as well as emphasizing the objectives of participants trying the recommended approach in their own classroom.

Written Evaluation of Workshop

(Time Required - 10 minutes)

Participants were given a questionnaire (see Figure 4) and asked to anonymously give their candid responses.

Written Test

(Time Required - 10 minutes)

In order to determine whether or not participants had comprehended, and were able to recall the main elements of the recommended approach to provocation, they were asked to briefly complete a written test (see Figure 5).

A teaching manual for the workshop is presented in Appendix A.

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

1. Did you enjoy the workshop?

   Yes ____
   No ____

2. Do you feel that the theoretical presentation was effective?

   Yes ____
   No ____

3. Were the modeling tapes helpful?

   Yes ____
   No ____

4. Do you think the modeling tapes portrayed realistic classroom situations?

   Yes ____
   No ____

   If not, please explain.

5. Was the role playing useful?

   Yes ____
   No ____

6. Do you feel you received accurate feedback from the observers in your group?

   Yes ____
   No ____

7. Do you feel that this workshop:
   - should be included in undergraduate teacher education courses?

     Yes ____
     No ____

   - should be made available to groups of teachers for professional development?

     Yes ____
     No ____

8. Do you think you will try this in your classroom?

   Yes ____
   No ____

9. Please write comments on the back.

Figure 4.

TEST

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

1. Briefly explain what Thomas Gordon believes about the teacher expressing anger in the classroom.

2. Thomas Gordon states that 90-95% of teachers respond to provoking situations in ways which, . . .

3. List the essential components of teacher response to provocation (as presented in the workshop).

a)

b)

c)

d)

e)

Figure 5.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF TREATMENT PROGRAM

In this chapter the author discusses the design for implementing and determining the effectiveness of the treatment program adopted in the present study. The hypotheses underlying the present study are listed, the sample is described, and the research design is discussed. The methods of subjective and objective evaluation of learning outcomes are elaborated.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed in order to assess the influence of the treatment program.

1. That teachers who have participated in the treatment program, will acquire an understanding of the recommended method of intervening with provoking students in the classroom, as evidenced by written test scores on a test designed to assess understanding of the method presented in the workshop.
2. That teachers who have participated in the treatment program, will be able to demonstrate the recommended method of intervening with provoking students in the classroom, as evidenced by treatment control group raters' score comparisons of videotaped role play confrontations.
3. That teachers who have participated in the treatment program will perceive this program to be relevant and useful to them in their teaching role, as evidenced by subjective evaluation comments.

Sample

The sample consisted of 44 experienced teachers, who were enrolled in an undergraduate educational psychology course, University of Alberta. All persons enrolled in this course participated in the project as part of course requirements. The subjects were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Once membership was assigned, the groups were compared on the factors of years of teaching experience, grade taught, location of school, and sex of participant.

Comparison of treatment and control group members, on the dimension of years of teaching experience, revealed similarity of this trait (see Table 1). The differences in mean years of teaching experience (treatment group - 8.7 years, control group - 12.2 years) is accounted for by the presence of three teachers in the control group with more than 25 years of experience.

Table 1

Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Years of Teaching Experience

Group	N	Less Than 5 years	5 to 9 years	10 or more years	Mean years
Treatment	22[a]	27%	27%	46%	8.7
Control	20	25%	20%	55%	12.2

a Two members of the treatment group did not submit the personal information requested.

On the factor of grade level taught, the makeup of the treatment and control groups appears similar (see Table 2). It is interesting to note that in both groups, at least 50% of the teachers teach kindergarten through grade three, and fewer than 20% of each group teach above the grade six level.

Table 2

Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Grade Level Taught

Group	N	K-gr.3	gr. 4-6	gr. 7-9	gr. 10-adult
Treatment	22	54%	32%	4.5%	9%
Control	20	50%	30%	15 %	5%

The dimension of location of school was examined because the experimenter understood that many of the workshop participants would be from outlying areas, and there was some concern that in randomizing assignment to groups, without controlling for this factor, there may be uneven distribution of this trait. Examination of Table 3 shows that this was not the case. The two groups had surprisingly similar makeup in this regard.

The two groups were also similar when compared on the basis of sex of the participants (see Table 4).

In summary, the sample consisted primarily of female kindergarten to grade six teachers, with an average of ten years teaching experience. Slightly more than one half of the subjects teach in the metropolitan Edmonton area, the others in outlying areas surrounding Edmonton.

Table 3

Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Location of School

Group	N	Metropolitan Area	Outlying Area
Treatment	22	59%	41%
Control	20	55%	45%

Note. Metropolitan area includes: Edmonton, St. Alberta, and Sherwood Park.

Outlying area includes: Morinville, Aldergrove, Barrhead, Fultonvale, Hobbema, Drayton Valley, Tomahawk, Darwell, and Onoway.

Table 4

Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on the Dimension: Sex of Participants

Group	N	Female	Male
Treatment	24	21	3
Control	20	16	4

Research Design

For analysis, the test measures of the treatment group were compared with the test measures of the control group. The test was administered to the control group while the workshop was conducted with the treatment group. The treatment group was then given the test while control group subjects attended the workshop.

Evaluation Methods

Program effectiveness was assessed by determining the extent to which participants: (1) gained an understanding of the approach recommended, (2) could behaviorally demonstrate this approach, when confronted with provoking students in role play situations, and (3) perceived the workshop to be relevant, enjoyable and useful.

Written Test

In order to determine if participants gained an understanding of the approach recommended in the workshop, they were asked to complete a brief written test (see Figure 6) at the conclusion of the workshop. (Suggested answers and scoring criteria have also been included in Figure 6.)

Videotaped Role Play Confrontations with Provoking Students

In order to attempt to determine whether or not workshop participants had in fact incorporated the recommended approach into their behavioral repertoire, all subjects were subjected to a contrived test situation (for the treatment group this test occurred after the workshop, for the control group, prior to the workshop). During the short (2 to 3 minute) role play sessions, subjects were confronted with two student actors, one of whom was portraying a provoking student in class. All role play confrontations were videotaped for the use of raters at a later date.

The two student actors, a twelve year old boy and a nine year old girl, were instructed and carefully rehearsed to

TEST

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

(a) or (b) earns 1 point

1. Briefly explain what Thomas Gordon believes about the teacher expressing anger in the classroom.

   a) Anger expressions are destructive.

   b) Often other feelings accompany anger and it may be more honest for the teacher to express these.

(a) or (b) earns 1 point

2. Thomas Gordon states that 90-95% of teachers respond to provoking situations in ways which,. . .

   a) put students down (e.g. ridicule, blame, embarrass, order, criticize, shame, etc.)

   b) evoke resistance to change

any 3 of these 5 earns 1 point

3. List the essential components of teacher response to provocation (as presented in the workshop).

   a) state the problem

   b) state the effect on the teacher

   c) state feelings generated in teacher

   d) focus on student

   e) give the student an opportunity to respond

Total: 3 points

Figure 6.

initiate provoking behavior. Each student actor rehearsed two different provoking incidents, the girl was to: (1) behave in an inattentive manner while the teacher gave detailed instructions, then ask what was supposed to be done, and (2) pass a derogatory cartoon of the teacher to her classmate, in an interruptive manner when the teacher was talking. The boy was instructed to: (1) mutter (loud enough to be heard by the teacher) "What a bore!" just after the teacher introduced the topic for the lesson, and (2) refuse to move when the teacher requested him to do so. The students were instructed, and rehearsed with several adults, to then respond to the teachers in whatever manner seemed most natural, realistic and authentic to them. For example, if the teacher responded in such a way that they felt cooperative - to cooperate, or if they felt apologetic - to apologize, or if they felt antagonistic - to antagonize further, etc.. The students rotated the order in which they role played the different situations. This rotation allowed each student a break from his (or her) provoking role, and allowed him (or her) to focus on a different incident each time it was his (or her) turn. In all test situations each student actor portrayed a provoking student 20 times. Both students were present in each situation, in order to promote greater realism for all participants.

Control subjects were given the following instructions:

> This afternoon's workshop will focus on ways of dealing with students who provoke teachers in the classroom, and we feel it would be useful for you to try out interacting with a real child in a provoking situation ahead of time.

I want you to imagine that you are at the end of what has been a long, rather frustrating day. Think about a child or children in your own classroom who tend to frustrate you.

Now when you enter this room, you will be videotaped in a role play situation with a young grade 6 boy, Mike (or a grade 4 girl, Jill), who will do something which would annoy or provoke you as the teacher.

Please respond to the child's provoking behavior with the most effective means you know of to deal with the situation. Do not use ignoring.

You will be welcome to view this tape at a later date if you wish.

Treatment subjects were given identical instructions, with the exception of the first paragraph, which for these subjects read:

This morning's workshop focused on learning a particular method of dealing with provoking students in the classroom. We would now like to see if you can demonstrate this method with a real child in a provoking situation.

Rating of Videotaped Role Play Confrontations

Prior to rating, segments of the test situation videotapes were combined in a random order and transferred to master tapes for use by raters.

Three raters were trained to rate the videotaped role play confrontations, scoring points for the simple presence or absence of the criteria described in Figure 7. Two raters then independently viewed and rated each role play segment.

The majority of the taped teacher-student interactions were 2½ to 3 minutes in length, however, several teachers

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

RATING CRITERIA

Subject # _____ Rater _____

Criteria	Description	Frequency
1. States the problem (e.g. throwing books on the floor, disturbing others, not listening, interrupting, refusing to do as I ask).		
2. States the effect of the problem on the teacher (e.g. I can't concentrate, I have to repeat instructions, I find it distracting, It is wasting teaching time).		
3. Expresses feelings (e.g. This is frustrating me, I find this upsetting, I'm getting annoyed). Note: Do not count "How do you think I feel" or "I'm tired too" or "I don't like doing it either, etc.		
4. Focuses on the student (e.g. movement toward the student, using the student's name).		
5. Gives the student an opportunity to respond (e.g. pausing, open-ended questions, asking student's opinion).		

Subject's Score: _____ (the number of criteria demonstrated)
Note. Maximum score possible is 5 points.

Figure 7.

left the room before time was up, consequently, these segments were less than 2½ minutes. Raters were instructed to consistently rate only the first 2½ minutes of teacher-student interaction (using a timer), or to rate the entire interaction in those few cases where the segment was less than 2½ minutes in length.

For analysis, scores were counted only if they were recorded by both independent raters. For example, if one rater scored a particular teacher as having expressed feelings (criteria #3), and the second rater did not, then the teacher did not receive a point for expressing feelings.

Subjective Evaluation

In an attempt to determine to what extent the participants perceived the workshop to be relevant, enjoyable and useful, and in order to obtain suggestions regarding areas for improvement, all workshop participants were requested to anonymously and candidly complete a questionnaire (see Figure 4) at the conclusion of the workshop. Results of these questionnaires were tabulated, and are reported in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the written test, the videotaped role play confrontations and the subjective evaluations, will be presented and discussed.

Results

Results of Written Test

Hypothesis one states: that teachers who have participated in the treatment program will acquire an understanding of the recommended method of intervening with provoking students in the classroom, as evidenced by written test scores, on a test designed to assess understanding of the method presented in the workshop.

At the conclusion of the workshop, treatment subjects were requested to complete a brief written test (see Figure 6, p. 54 for test items and scoring criteria), in order to determine if they had an understanding of the recommended method of intervening with provoking students. Answers to test questions were scored according to the criteria outlined, and the following results were obtained for each item.

Question #1 Briefly explain what Thomas Gordon believes about the teacher expressing anger in the classroom.

21 of the 24 respondents (87.5%) answered this question in a way which met the criteria identified.

Question #2 Thomas Gordon states that 90-95% of teachers respond to provoking situations in ways which, ...

21 of the 24 respondents (87.5%) answered this question in a way which met the criteria identified.

Question #3 List the essential components of teacher response to provocation (as presented in the workshop).

20 of the 24 respondents (83%) answered this question in a way which met the criteria identified. 16 of the 24 respondents (67%) were able to recall four or five components of teacher responses, even though only three components were required to meet the criteria of this item. Only 4 of the 24 respondents were unable to recall three components of teacher response, 3 recalling only two components and 1 subject recalling just one.

On the total test scores 18 of the 24 respondents (75) answered all three test items in a way which met the criteria identified. 2 of the 24 respondents (8%) answered two of the three questions satisfactorily, and 4 of the 24 respondents (15%) answered only one of the three questions satisfactorily.

In view of the findings reported, hypothesis one is supported.

Videotaped Role Play Confrontations

Hypothesis two states: that teachers who have participated in the treatment program, will be able to demonstrate the recommended method of intervening with provoking students in the classroom, as evidenced by treatment-control group raters' score comparisons of videotaped role play confrontations.

Role play confrontations were rated as outlined in Chapter IV (see figure 7, p. 57 for detailed description of criteria). Raters' scores for treatment and control groups are reported in tables 5 and 6. The raters obtained 95% agreement and, as mentioned earlier, any discrepant points were not included in the subjects' scores.

In summary, it appears that the treatment subjects were significantly better able to demonstrate all individual criteria outlined, with the exception of focusing on the student, which was demonstrated by all subjects. Also, it is apparent that the mean performance of treatment subjects was significantly better than the mean performance of the controls. Consequently, hypothesis two is supported.

Subjective Evaluation

Hypothesis three states: that teachers who have participated in the treatment program will perceive the program to be relevant, and useful to them in their teaching role, as evidenced in their comments on the subjective evaluation.

At the conclusion of the workshop, treatment subjects were requested to anonymously and candidly complete a

Table 5

A Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on Individual Criteria

Criteria	Treatment (N=23) frequency of response	Treatment (N=23) % of response	Control (N=18) frequency of response	Control (N=18) % of response	z score
#1 (States the problem)	17	74%	1	5.5%	4.39**
#2 (States the effect)	12	52%	0	0 %	3.64**
#3 (Expresses feelings)	22	96%	0	0 %	6.12**
#4 (Focuses on the student)	23	100%	18	100 %	-
#5 (Gives opportunity to respond)	15	65%	6	33 %	2.04*

** significant at the .01 level for one-tailed test
* significant at the .05 level for one-tailed test

Table 6

A Comparison of Treatment and Control Groups on Mean Total Scores

Group	N	Mean	SD	t
Treatment	23	3.9	1	10.46***
Control	18	1.4	.5	

Note. Welch's adjustment (Ferguson, 1971, pp. 155-157) was used in light of the apparent discrepancy in population variances.

*** significant at the .0005 level for one-tailed test.

questionnaire (see figure 4, p. 47), giving their comments on the workshop. The results of this evaluation are summarized in Table 7. A sampling of participant comments appears below:

Regarding the theoretical presentation, one participant stated "might not have been enough if I hadn't done reading."

When asked if the modeling tapes were helpful, one participant stated "Yes, especially since there was a followup," and another, "Perhaps a film or more examples would help in developing principles."

In relation to the question - Do you think the modeling tapes portrayed realistic classroom situations? - the following comments were made:

"No, students are not always reasonable or mature enough to reason things out."

"No, there are many more pupils in class."

"Only to some extent, the manner of lesson presentation appeared to be the cause of the disruptive behavior."

"Yes, but perhaps the solutions came too quickly, in reality the teacher would have to struggle more."

"Yes, for the average middle junior high classroom."

"Yes. It would be impossible to have them totally realistic - they served the purpose."

"Yes, unfortunately, - the negative ones."

A number of suggestions were made regarding the role playing sessions. Two participants suggested that they would like to have observed other small groups role playing, and three suggested the need for more time. Other comments were:

"Discussion was more helpful."

Table 7

Summary of Treatment Subjects' Responses to Participant Evaluation N=24

Question	Yes	No	No Answer
1. Did you enjoy the workshop?	24	-	-
2. Do you feel the theoretical presentation was effective?	23	-	1
3. Were the modeling tapes helpful?	23	-	1
4. Do you think the modeling tapes portrayed realistic classroom situations?	19	3	2
5. Was the role playing useful?	21	2	1
6. Do you feel you received accurate feedback from the observers in your group?	23	-	1
7. Do you feel that this workshop:			
- Should be included in undergraduate teacher education?	23	-	1
- Should be made available to groups of teachers for professional development?	24	-	-
8. Do you think you will try this approach in your classroom?	22	-	2

"We got caught up discussing causality."

Regarding feedback from observers in the small groups, comments made were:

"We tended to get tangled up in complications."

"Yes, but difficult to do in such a short time."

"Feedback came from the whole group."

"Discussion was good - very observant of verbal communication - many times we fell short."

"They were very good at spotting feelings in myself."

In commenting on whether or not this workshop should be included in undergraduate and experienced teacher education, three participants said, "Definitely!" and three participants pointed out the importance of presenting such a program in conjunction with student teaching for undergraduates.

When asked if they would try this approach in their own classrooms, one participant stated, "I sometimes do." and another commented "Yes, but I'd need a lot of practice to change my mind."

The following general critical remarks were made:

"I'm dubious about whether or not it would work for long. I could foresee long arguments with a sympathetic teacher."

"Responding like this could be effective as an element of surprise, however, I feel that continued use would nullify effects.

"I would try this out, but it would be only one of the many strategies I would use. Putting this into practice would take time and effort on my part."

"I feel unsure of the effectiveness of this method, however, I do feel in certain situations it might work."

In responding to the live test situation (videotaped role play confrontations), many teachers directly and indirectly expressed anxiety, and expressed feeling threatened at the thought of someone assessing how they handled the situation. This points out the need to support teachers in research-related test situations. In this regard, it is recommended that teachers undergoing role play test situations with real children, have a session with an emphatic facilitator afterwards. Every subject in this project did have such a debriefing session, and many teachers used this time to express dissatisfaction with their own responses.

Aside from using the videotaped role play confrontations to obtain raters' scores, the material on the tapes provided considerable other information and insights. For example, although many of the teachers participating in the workshop expressed anxiety about the role playing, criticized it as unreal, and generally stated that they were unfamiliar and uncomfortable with it, they were most cooperative in attempting to immerse themselves in the teacher's role with the student actors, and many teachers engaged in resourceful, role-related adlibbing.

Other observations noted in viewing the tapes, include the different approach styles of younger versus older teachers, as well as male versus female teachers. Younger teachers appeared to do less 'preaching' and more consulting with the students. Male teachers appeared inclined to use intimidation (e.g. physically grasping the student's desk, or towering over

the student) more so than female teachers.

It was also interesting to note the extensive use (in treatment and control groups) of a negotiation process with provoking students (e.g. "What would you rather do?" or "What suggestions do you have to make this more interesting?" etc.). Also, the teachers generally appeared to respect students' property. For example, the student actor who was anticipating being caught with a derogatory cartoon of the teacher, found to her surprise, that teachers generally did not snatch this from her, or demand to see it, but rather, readily responded to her claims that it was hers, and did not investigate regarding the content. This, despite the fact that the students were passing the cartoon back and forth in a disruptive way and giggling at it.

Another interesting observation occurred in the situation during which one student actor was to fail to pay attention while instructions were being given out, then ask for a repetition. Most teachers responded immediately to the first cues indicating that the student was not paying attention, and actively engaged the student's attention to the task (e.g. by pointing to the student's page, or requesting the student to read out instructions, etc.) before proceeding. One further interesting observation was that the student actor who was not playing out a provoking student in a given segment, frequently spontaneously aligned himself or herself with the teacher, behaved in a 'model' fashion, and engaged in positive interaction with the teacher.

One factor that becomes very apparent on viewing the videotaped role play confrontations is that the student actors tended to 'overact' their provocative behaviors. They behaved in a manner more provocative than the role they rehearsed, and they persisted with their provoking behavior regardless of the teacher's response. While at times they automatically responded with compliance, they generally quickly resumed a provoking role.

One possible reason for this occurrence may be the impact of the research assistant who praised and encouraged the student actors regarding provoking behaviors demonstrated in the first few segments, and suggested that they be persistent. Another factor may be the influence of partipating in the confrontations with the second student actor, whereas each student had rehearsed with just adults. On breaks between segments, the student actors could be heard giggling about aspects of their performance, sharing perceptions of how the teacher handled the situation, and avidly planning their next approach.

This 'overacting' was probably a blessing in disguise, in that the student actors remained enthusiastic about their own roles, and intrigued by what the teachers would do in response, throughout the day. It was probably also beneficial in the respect that it gave teachers repeated opportunities to try out responses to provoking behavior. In many instances, it was noted that treatment subjects responded initially with rather automatic behaviors, and only as the provoking behavior persisted, were able to try out the recommended approach.

One disadvantage of the 'overacting' was the fact that it aroused frustration in the teachers, and many of them arrived in the debriefing session feeling badly and defensive about their attempts to deal with the situation. They required reassurance that the student actors were unreasonably persistent, and that their attempts to handle the situation would probably have more impact on students in a real classroom.

In any case, the students were remarkably consistent in the intensity and persistence of their provoking behaviors, and they played out their roles seriously, without once breaking into laughter or otherwise interrupting their acts during taping.

A few comments concerning student actor preparation may be useful here. Considerable care was administered in introducing the project to the student actors, and in discussing their possible participation. It was considered crucial that the students clearly understood the objectives of the project, and in particular, that they understood the purpose of the videotaped role play confrontations, and that they perceived their roles as contributing to a learning process for teachers. The student actors did appear to adopt this understanding and perception, as evidenced by their spontaneous alignment with the teachers during their neutral roles, their polite and friendly interaction with the teachers following segments, and their ability to discuss their evaluations of various teacher approaches at the conclusion of the project.

One final observation regarding the videotaped role play confrontations concerns the component of expressing feelings.

As discussed in Chapter I, Thomas Gordon (1974) has found in his teacher effectiveness training programs, that teachers who are learning to make 'I' statements expressing their feelings, initially tend to rely on the expression of angry feelings rather than expressing feelings which may be underlying their anger. It is interesting to note, that in this study, 70% of the treatment subjects were successful in expressing feelings other than anger (e.g. disappointment, upset, frustration, unhappiness, etc.) even though 25% of these subjects accompanied such feeling expressions with expressions of anger and annoyance. It is evident on viewing the tapes, that teachers could use assistance in learning to express feelings with congruence, since many of their feeling statements are made neutrally, without appropriate gesticulations and tone of voice.

One further outcome of the workshop was the collection of 73 specific examples of provoking behavior in the classroom, from workshop participants. These examples were used during the role play sessions, and could be used in future for modeling situations and examples during the initial presentation of the method to be learned.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The general purpose of this study was to develop, implement and evaluate a program designed to teach teachers to respond effectively to provocation in the classroom. More specifically, the intent was to develop a workshop which could be used as inservice training for experienced teachers, or as a learning module in undergraduate teacher education.

The workshop developed, incorporates a theoretical presentation, modeling, and guided role playing. Evaluation involved subjective evaluation by participants, a short written test, and raters' comparisons of treatment versus control subjects' handling of videotaped role play confrontations with provoking student actors.

Conclusions

The results demonstrate the general effectiveness of the workshop in teaching the recommended method of intervention. Statistically significant differences were obtained on four out of the five components taught, and also on the raters' comparisons of the treatment versus control group total scores on the composite response taught.

The results of participants' subjective evaluations, as well as the literature review, support the need for such a program as the one developed in this study, particularly since such a program does not appear to be otherwise available.

Aside from the treatment effects, other interesting information and insights were gained. It was found that, while teachers expressed anxiety and discomfort with role playing, they appeared to willingly participate in, and benefit from this as a learning method. It was also found that, while teachers do tend to focus on disruptive students, and on occasion give them opportunities to respond, that the components which may be described as involving assertiveness, (i.e. stating the problem, stating how this problem is affecting the teacher, and expressing feelings), do not seem to naturally occur in teacher response to provocation. This suggests the possible value of focusing more specifically on teaching each of these components, as suggested by Bandura (1977) prior to attempting a composite response. It was also apparent that teachers require particular assistance in expressing feelings, in such a way that their non-verbal behaviors are congruent with their verbal responses.

Recommendations

Program Improvements

A number of suggestions for program improvement follow naturally from the discussion of results presented in the previous chapter. One improvement recommended would be provision for more extensive role playing, perhaps interspersed with quality feedback, and further modeling of the recommended method. The quality of feedback could possibly be augmented by making videotaping and playback equipment

available to each small group. These changes would unfortunately involve the need for extra time, money and organizational effort. Implementing such changes would probably require at least a full day workshop, whereas, in the present study, teachers were available for only a half day focus on this topic.

It is further recommended, that consideration be given to supportive followup measures, designed to facilitate teachers incorporating the new response pattern in their own classroom. This improvement would also require an extended time commitment and expense.

Further Research

It is recommended that consideration be given to the usefulness of studying the behaviors of teachers in video-taped role play confrontations with student actors, as a teaching method. For example, it would be interesting to have teachers examine and criticize their own responses on viewing the tapes, then return to the role play situation and attempt to modify their response in a specific direction. Such a measure may promote what Bandura (1977) refers to as corrective self adjustments.

It is further recommended that the matter of typical teacher responses to provocation be further explored. While Gordon (1974) maintains that teachers tend to put students down in response to their own feelings of personal threa., could it be that teachers put students down more out of a

response to general role expectations? If this is the case, teachers may require assistance to recognize and modify their role expectations.

It is also recommended that attention be directed toward facilitation of attitudinal change, particularly in practicing teachers. It is apparent that specific behavioral changes can result from short workshops, however, it is anticipated that significant qualitative changes in teacher's interpersonal responses would necessitate courses or longer programs developed with this objective in mind.

One further recommendation involves the matter of teaching congruence between verbal and non-verbal responses. It would seem that teachers would benefit from some of the methods presently used in teaching counsellors this response pattern.

In summary, the results demonstrate the effectiveness of the workshop developed in conjunction with this study, in that teachers in the treatment group were significantly better able to demonstrate the recommended approach to student provocation than were the control subjects. Also the teachers who participated in the workshop were most enthusiastic about it, describing it as relevant, enjoyable and useful to them in their teaching role. They also expressed the need and desire for other programs of this nature to be developed to assist them with student-teacher interaction.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Alschuler, A., and Shea, J. V. The discipline game: Playing without losers. Learning, 1974, 3, 80-86.

American Psychological Association. Publication Manual (2nd ed.). Washington, 1974.

Anderson, R.C., and Faust, G. W. Educational Psychology: The Science of Instruction and Learning. New York: Dodd and Mead, 1973.

Aspy, D. N. A study of three facilitative conditions and their relationships to achievement of third grade students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1965.

Bandura, A. Psychological Modeling. New York: Aldine-Atherton Inc., 1971.

Bandura, A. Social Learning Theory. Toronto: Prentice Hall Inc., 1977.

Bandura, A., and Jeffrey, R. W. The role of symbolic coding and rehearsal processes in observational learning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 122-130.

Bandura, A., and McDonald, F. J. The influence of social reinforcement and the behavior of models in shaping children's moral judgements. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 274-281.

Bidwell, C. E. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Brenneman, O. N., Willower, D. J., and Lynch, P. D. Teacher self-acceptance, acceptance of others, and pupil control ideology. Journal of Experimental Education, 1975, 44, 14-17.

Brophy, J. E., and Good, T.L. Teacher-Student Relationships. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Brown, E. J., and Phelps, A. T. Managing the Classroom. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Cangemi, J. P., and Khan, K. H. The psychology of punishment and the potential school dropout. Education, 1973, 94, 117-119.

Carducci, R. J. A comparison of I-messages with commands in the control of disruptive classroom behavior. Dissertations Abstract International, 1976, 36 (B), 5783.

Carkhuff, R. R., and Berenson, R. G. Beyond Counselling and Therapy. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Carnot, J. B. Dynamic and effective school discipline. Clearing House, 1973, 48, 150-153.

Chamberlain, L. J., and Weinberger, M. Games teachers play. Instructor, 1971, 80, 69.

Chamberlin, L. J. Effective Instruction Through Dynamic Discipline. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1971.

Chiu, L. The student teacher and discipline problems. Journal of Educational Research, 1975, 69, 69-72.

Davidson, E. S., and Liebert, R. M. Effects of prior commitment on children's evaluation and intimidation of a peer model's perceptual judgements. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1972, 35, 825-826.

Dowling, T. H., and Frantz, T. T. The influence of facilitative relationship on imitative learning. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1975, 22 259-263.

Dreikurs, R. Children: The Challenge. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1964.

Dreikurs, R. Coping With Children's Misbehavior. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1972.

Dreikurs, R., and Cassell, P. Discipline Without Tears. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1973.

Dreikurs, R., and Grey, L. Logical Consequences. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1968.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., and Pepper, F. C. Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Driscoll, R. L. A survey of pupil disruptive behaviors as viewed by student teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, (A), 281-282.

Dunkin, M. J., and Biddle, B. J. The Study of Teaching. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Eisler, R. M., Hersen, M., and Miller, P. M. Effects of modeling on components of assertive behavior. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1973, 4, 1-6.

Eisler, R. M., Hersen, M., Miller, P. M., and Blanchard, E. B. Situational determinants of assertive behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 330-340.

Esveldt, K. C., Dawson, P. C., and Forness, S. R. Effect of videotaped feedback on children's classroom behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 67, 453-56.

Erdman, C. D. The effects of didactic, modeling, and laboratory training on the display of counselor expertness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34 (B), 4038.

Eskedal, G. A. Symbolic role modeling and cognitive learning in the training of counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 152-55.

Fensterheim, H., and Baer, J. Don't Say Yes When You Want to Say No. New York: Dell Publishing, 1975.

Ferguson, G. A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Fink, A. H. Behavior management training through simulation and roleplaying. Viewpoints, 1973, 49, 71-84.

Forehand, R., Roberts, M. W., Doleys, D. M., Hobbs, S. A., and Resick, P. A. An examination of disciplinary procedures with children. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1976, 21, 109-120.

Francis, P. Beyond Control? London, George Allen and Unwin, 1975.

Friedman, P. H. The effects of modeling and role playing on assertive behavior. In R. D. Rubin, H. Fensterheim, A. A. Lazarus, and C. M. Franks (Eds.), Advances In Behavior Therapy. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Fromm, E. Escape From Freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941.

Ginott, H. I am angry! I am appalled! I am furious! Today's Education, 1972, 61, 23-24. (a)

Ginott, H. Teacher and Child. New York: Macmillan Co., 1972. (b)

Gnagey, W. J. Maintaining Discipline in Classroom Instruction. New York: Macmillan Co., 1975.

Good, T. L., Biddle, B. J., and Brophy, J. E. Teachers Make a Difference. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Gordon, T. T. E. T. Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Wyden, 1974.

Griepenstroh, G., and Miskel, C. Training groups and student teachers' pupil control ideology. Planning and Change, 1976, 6, 177-184.

Gronlund, N. E. Stating Behavioral Objectives for Classroom Instruction. Toronto: Collier-Macmillan, 1970.

Halpin, G., Goldenberg, R. and Halpin, G. Are creative teachers more humanistic in their pupil control ideologies? Journal of Creative Behavior, 1973, 7, 282-286.

Henry, P. L. Training teachers for one-to-one pupil-teacher encounters. College Student Journal, 1975, 9, 179-190.

Hersen, M., Eisler, R. M., and Miller, P. M. Effects of practice, instructions, modeling, on components of assertive behavior. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 443-51.

Holt, J., Ginott, H., Salk, L., and Barr, D. Discipline: The most perplexing subject of all. Teacher, 1972, 90, 54-56.

Hoy, W. K. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 312-324.

Jensen, R. E. Cooperative relations between secondary teachers and students: some behavioral strategies. Adolescence, 1975, 10, 469-482.

Joyce, B., and Weil, M. Models of Teaching. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Jones, P. L., and Blankenship, J. W. The relationship of pupil control ideology and innovative classroom practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1972, 9, 281-285.

Kaplan, B. L. Discipline is more than technique. Elementary School Journal, 1973, 73, 244-250.

Karlin, M. S., and Berger, R. Discipline and the Disruptive Child. New York: Parker, 1972.

Kass, R. E., and Drabman, R. S. The effects of loud and soft reprimands on the behavior of disruptive students. Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 145-155.

Keasey, C. B. Experimentally induced changes in moral opinion and reasoning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 30-38.

Keith, L. T., Tornatzky, L. G., and Pettigrew, L. E. An analysis of verbal and nonverbal classroom teaching behaviors. Journal of Experimental Education, 1974, 42, 30-38.

Kirschner, N. M., and Levin, L. A direct school intervention program for the modification of aggressive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 12, 202-208.

Kounin, J. S. Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Leard, H. M. The elementary counsellor and discipline. Canadian Counsellor, 1974, 8, 126-136.

Lehman, J. D. The effects of empathy training involving modeling, feedback, and reinforcement on the ability of high school students to respond empathically in a tutoring situation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34 (A), 3993.

Mager, R. F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto: Feron, 1962.

Mixer, A. S., and Milson, J. L. Teaching and the self. Clearing House, 1973, 47, 346-350.

McCarthy, M. D. Humanitarianism and corporal punishment. Education, 1975, 95, 212-215.

McGuire, D., Thelen, M. H., and Amolsch, T. Interview self-disclosure as a function of length of modeling and descriptive instructions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 356-362.

McNeil, J. D. Assessment of teacher competence. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

National Education Association. Discipline and Learning. Washington, 1975.

Nicholls, A., and Nicholls, S. H. Developing a Curriculum. London: Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1972.

Novaco, R. W. Anger Control: The Development and Evaluation of an Experimental Treatment. Lexington Books, 1975.

O'Conner, R. D. Modification of social withdrawal through symbolic modeling. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2, 15-22.

O'Conner, R. D. Relative efficacy of modeling, shaping, and the combined practices for modification of social withdrawal. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1972, 79, 327-334.

O'Keefe, M., and Smaby, M. Seven techniques for solving classroom discipline problems. High School Journal, 1973, 56, 190-199.

Palardy, J. M., and Mudrey, J. E. Discipline: Four approaches. Elementary School Journal, 1973, 73, 297-305.

Peck, R. F., and Tucker, J. A. Research in teacher education. In R. M. W. Travers (Ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Perry, M. A. Modeling and instructions in training for counsellor empathy. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1975, 22, 173-179.

Postman, N., and Weingartner, C. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Prentice, N. M. The influence of live and symbolic modeling on promoting moral judgement of adolescent delinquents. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1972, 80, 157-161.

Purkey, W. W., and Avila, D. Classroom Discipline: a new approach. Elementary School Journal, 1971, 71, 325-328.

Rachman, S. Clinical applications of observational learning, imitation and modeling. Behavior Therapy, 1972, 3, 379-397.

Rimm, D. C., and Masters, J. C. Behavior Therapy. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Robinson, N. W. Usual social modeling and rehearsal in assertive training, Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34 (B), 6222-6223.

Rogers, C. R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Rudner, H. L. A practical model for controlling a group of behavior problems in the classroom. Canadian Counsellor, 1973, 7, 119-125.

Rudner, H. L. Effects of Modeling and Role Playing on Assertive Behavior in Children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1976.

Sansbury, D. L. Assertive training in groups. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1974, 53, 117-122.

Sarason, I. G., and Ganzer, V. J. Modeling and group discussion in the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 26, 442-449.

Smith, M. J. When I Say No, I Feel Guilty. New York: Bantam Books, 1975.

Snider, S. J., and Murphy, W. C. Discipline--What can it teach? Elementary School Journal, 1975, 75, 299-303.

Solomon, D., and Kendall, A. J. Teacher's perceptions of and reactions to misbehavior in traditional and open classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, 528-530.

Spencer, R. J. An empirical study of elementary teacher's attention as reinforcement for student behavior. Child Study Journal, 1973, 3, 145-148.

Stoff, S., and Schwartzberg, H. The Human Encounter. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Truax, C. B., and Carkhuff, R. P. Toward Effective Counselling and Psychotherapy. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Vander Kolk, C. J. Developing effectiveness through interpersonal skill training. College Student Journal, 1975, 9, 251-255.

Willson, S. Development of the School Contracting Manual: Teacher Version. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1976.

Winston, S. Do we dare close down the teacher lunch room? "Thrust" for Education Leadership, 1976, 5, 25-26.

Wolf, T. M., and Cheyne, J. A. Persistence of effects of live behavioral, televised behavioral and live verbal models on resistance to deviation. Child Development, 1972, 43, 1429-1436.

Yarrow, M. R., Scott, P. M. and Waxler, C. Z. Learning concern for others. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 240-260.

Zigler, E., and Yando, R. Outerdirectedness and imitative behavior of institutionalized and noninstitutionalized younger and older children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 413-425.

Zimmerman, B. J., and Rosenthal, T. L. Concept attainment, transfer and retention through observation, and rule-provision. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1972, 13, 139-159.

Zingle, H. W. Personal communication, May 26, 1977.

APPENDIX A

TEACHING TEACHERS TO RESPOND EFFECTIVELY TO PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM: TEACHING MANUAL

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

WORKSHOP FORMAT

General Introduction and Objectives of the Workshop	15 minutes
Viewing of Modeling Tapes and Discussion	30 minutes
Essential Components of Teacher Response to Student Provocation	15 minutes

COFFEE BREAK

Examples of Provoking Situations from Workshop Participants	15 minutes
Role Play Practice in Small Groups	1 hour
Summary and Feedback	15 minutes
Written Evaluation of Workshop and Test	20 minutes

Note to workshop facilitator: Re Introduction

After welcoming participants to the workshop, the facilitator may wish to encourage them to share some information regarding their teaching background. This may assist participants to choose role play groups.

It is the intent of the introduction to demonstrate that there is a need for teachers to learn more effective methods of dealing with provoking students, as well as to briefly introduce the method to be taught, and stimulate interest.

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

INTRODUCTION

Teachers at times encounter classroom situations (students who are forgetful, interrupt, don't pay attention, etc.), which arouse feelings of frustration, irritation and anger, and they deal with these situations in a variety of ways. Thomas Gordon's research in teacher effectiveness, however, has revealed that 90-95% of such teacher responses to provoking situations, involve some negative evaluation of the student, and foster resistance to change. Hence, he suggests the need for teachers to learn to confront provoking students in ways which have a lower probability of damaging the student's self-esteem, and at the same time, a higher probability of influencing them to modify their own behavior. Gordon has found that when children are told (in an honest and non-blaming way) how their behavior affects the teacher, they are generally surprised, and they respond more often than teachers would imagine, simply out of consideration for their teacher's needs.

This workshop will focus on Gordon's method of confronting provoking students, a method which fosters an honest expression of feeling from the teacher, and lets the student know just how his behavior is interfering with the teacher's needs. Yet, the responsibility for formulating a response to the teacher's confrontation remains clearly with the student, in that the teacher does not tell the

student what he should feel or do. This is not a matter of teachers simply learning to vent anger towards students, as venting anger tends to make students more aggressive and reactive in return.

Gordon recommends that teachers examine their feelings and try to identify their responses to particular provoking situations in the classroom. He maintains that many other feelings frequently accompany anger. For example, the teacher may experience hurt, frustration, embarrassment, discouragement, insult or disappointment as the primary feeling when provoked, yet may habitually attempt to control all expression of feeling, or respond with angry feelings which blame, ridicule, embarrass or criticize the student.

The method of confrontation being focused on in this workshop necessitates authentic self disclosure on the part of the teacher, and consequently, requires teachers to identify what their feeling response is in the particular situation, and to share these feelings with the student concerned, without insulting them or putting them down. This method of dealing with provoking situations, assists students to perceive their teachers as real people with their own needs, people with whom they can have meaningful relationships.

Note to workshop facilitator: Re Objectives

Distribute copies of the objectives to participants.

It is recommended that participants be encouraged to explore the meaning of these objectives for them as individuals, and as a group. It is hoped that participants will feel a commitment to the stated objectives, or that they will suggest an alternate, more personally relevant statement of objectives.

OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

GENERAL: To facilitate teachers learning an appropriate method of intervening when students provoke them in the classroom.

Specific Objectives

To assist teachers to:

1. Consider alternate ways of handling provoking classroom situations other than by venting anger or controlling expression of feeling.

2. Identify classroom situations which they personally find provoking.

3. Develop a cognitive understanding of Gordon's method of intervening in provoking situations.

4. Demonstrate behaviors consistent with Gordon's method of intervening in provoking situations.

Note to workshop facilitator: Re Modeling Tapes

Distribute guides for viewing modeling tape.

It is recommended that the modeling tape be stopped following each segment to allow for discussion stimulated by the guide questions, as well as other self-initiated responses by participants and facilitator. It is hoped that participants will begin to recognize the elements of the recommended method.

GUIDE FOR VIEWING MODELING TAPES

Negative Example

1. What things did the teacher say or do that may have caused the student to feel insulted or put down?

2. How might the teacher have handled this situation differently?

Positive Example

1. Was there a genuine expression of feeling by the teacher? If so, what feelings were expressed?

2. What was unacceptable to the teacher?

3. Did the teacher say what effect the student's behavior had on her?

4. In what ways did the teacher focus on the student?

5. Was the student given an opportunity to respond?

Note to workshop facilitator: Re Essential Components of Teacher Response to Provocation in the Classroom

Distribute copies of Essential Components of Teacher Response to Provocation in the Classroom.

It is recommended that these components be discussed and elaborated with examples from the facilitator and the participants.

It may be helpful to provide a list of these components (on a blackboard, overhead projector or newsprint) which is readily visible to all participants as they role play.

ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF TEACHER RESPONSE TO PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

(adapted from Thomas Gordon)

1. State the problem (i.e. what is the student doing that is unacceptable?).

2. State what effect this problem has on the Teacher.

3. Express the feelings generated in the Teacher.

4. Focus on the student (e.g. eye contact, use of the student's name, movement toward the student, etc.).

5. Give the student an opportunity to respond.

Note to workshop facilitator: Re Examples of Provoking Behavior in the Classroom

Distribute three copies of Examples of Provoking Behavior in the Classroom, to each participant prior to coffee break.

It is recommended that the facilitator discuss the desirability of obtaining relevant, realistic provoking situations to be used as the basis of role playing. Distributing these forms prior to coffee break may facilitate informal discussion of the topic during the break.

EXAMPLES OF PROVOKING BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM

Please describe an incident which has occurred in your classroom which caused you to feel frustrated, irritated, or angry with a student or students.

1. Describe the context of the provoking incident (e.g. class activity at the time, what happened just before, grade level).

2. What exactly did the student do or say that was provoking? (Include nonverbal behavior.)

3. What was the teacher's reaction? (Include nonverbal behavior.)

4. Describe the outcome.

Note to workshop facilitator: Re Role Playing

Request participants to divide into groups of three and to designate one member as the teacher, one as the student, and one as an observer for each situation role played.

Distribute and discuss the Observer Guide for Role Play Situations, encouraging participants to give honest feedback to those role playing.

Suggest that group members rotate roles after each role play situation so that all participants experience several trials in each role.

It is recommended that participants use their own personal examples of provoking situations as the basis of role playing. The facilitator may, however, be wise to have extra situations at hand should the need arise.

It is further recommended that the facilitator circulate among role playing groups providing additional modeling where necessary, giving suggestions to those in the teacher's role, and providing support and encouragement for role playing attempts.

OBSERVER GUIDE FOR ROLE PLAY SITUATIONS

1. Did the teacher state what the problem behavior was?

   Yes ____
   No ____

2. Did the teacher state what effect this behavior had on her/him? Yes ____
   No ____

3. Did the teacher express her/his feelings?

   Yes ____
   No ____

   If so, did she/he do so in a non-blaming way? Yes ____
   No ____

   in a genuine way? Yes ____
   No ____

4. Did the teacher focus on the student concerned?

   Yes ____
   No ____

   How did the teacher demonstrate this?

5. Did the teacher give the student an opportunity to respond?

   Yes ____
   No ____

6. Other comments?

ROLE PLAY - SITUATION #1

Context: In a Grade IV classroom, the teacher is starting the arithmetic lesson, and in so doing requests that students take out their homework to check their results. Mark, once again, has forgotten his books at home.

Suggested Dialogue

Teacher: "Okay, we'll move on to arithmetic now. Would you please take out your homework assignment from yesterday?"

Mark: (9 years) (Exclaiming) "Oh oh, I can't! . . .I don't have my books here!"

Teacher:

ROLE PLAY - SITUATION #2

Context: In a Grade III classroom, the teacher is introducing a science project when Jim sighs and mutters just loud enough for those around him (including the teacher) to hear that he finds this boring.

Suggested Dialogue

Teacher: "I would like you each to choose two other people to work with during this project and . . . ."

Jim: (8 years) (Sighing and muttering) "Oh brother, what a bore!"

Teacher:

ROLE PLAY - SITUATION #3

Context: In a Grade II classroom, the teacher is reading a story to the class, when Sandy starts to loudly tap a pen on her desk.

Suggested Dialogue

Sandy: (7 years) (Slouched in chair, loudly tapping pen on desk as teacher reads aloud)

Teacher:

TEST

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

1. Briefly explain what Thomas Gordon believes about the teacher expressing anger in the classroom.

2. Thomas Gordon states that 90-95% of teachers respond to provoking situations in ways which, . . .

3. List the essential components of teacher response to provocation (as presented in the workshop).

   a)

   b)

   c)

   d)

   e)

Note to workshop facilitator: Re Summary, Feedback and Evaluation

It is recommended that participants be given an opportunity to engage in unstructured sharing of experiences from the role play sessions.

Distribute Participant Evaluations.

It is recommended that participants be encouraged to give candid comments regarding the workshop, and to make suggestions for improvement wherever possible.

RESPONDING TO STUDENT PROVOCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

1. Did you enjoy the workshop?

   Yes ____
   No ____

2. Do you feel that the theoretical presentation was effective?

   Yes ____
   No ____

3. Were the modeling tapes helpful?

   Yes ____
   No ____

4. Do you think the modeling tapes portrayed realistic classroom situations?

   Yes ____
   No ____

   If not, please explain.

5. Was the role playing useful?

   Yes ____
   No ____

6. Do you feel you received accurate feedback from the observers in your group?

   Yes ____
   No ____

7. Do you feel that this workshop:
   - should be included in undergraduate teacher education courses?

     Yes ____
     No ____

   - should be made available to groups of teachers for professional development?

     Yes ____
     No ____

8. Do you think you will try this in your classroom?

   Yes ____
   No ____

9. Please write comments on the back.